

The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



Werner's St. Paul and Irenaeus *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* von Oscar von Gebhardt und Adolf Harnack. VI. Band. Heft 2. Der Paulinismus des Irenaeus Eine Kirchen- und dogmengechichtliche Untersuchung über das Verhält niss des Irenaeus zu der Paulinischen Briefsammlung und Theologie. Von Lic. Dr. Johannes Werner, Privatdocent an der Universität Marburg. Leipzig, 1889. pp. 218.

A. Plummer

The Classical Review / Volume 4 / Issue 08 / October 1890, pp 367 - 368

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00191024, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00191024

How to cite this article:

A. Plummer (1890). The Classical Review, 4, pp 367-368 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00191024

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

says he follows the latter. He should at least have given his arguments. (iv.) *The results of their own reading*; especially in Thucydides. Cobet (*Mnem.* x. p. 84-94) already showed the value of the Atticists in studying the text of Thucydides. They are not so strict as Phrynichus, since they admit the new Comedy as evidence for Attic. What was the relation between them and their contemporaries Pollux and Harpocration, Schwabe leaves undecided. Nor has he any fresh information about the author called Ἀντιαττικιστής (B.A.G. p. 77). He even omits to say that this author has something in common with the fragments of Aristophanes. In concluding he reverts to the cautious subject with which he began, by admitting that the Scholia do not contain so much of the Atticists as he formerly supposed.

The new editor has done good service to Aelius and Pausanias. The value of his service may be gauged by comparing his Index of the authors quoted by them with the corresponding enumeration at p. 17 of Rindfleisch's dissertation. For instance, in Rindfleisch's fragments, Aristophanes com. is referred to eight times: in Schwabe's,

twenty-four times. But it would be rash to imagine that we have here the final edition. Probably when the fragments of all the grammarians are collected with the care of Nauck and the caution of Schwabe, when Boysen's promised edition of Eudemus has appeared—even then, perhaps, not until a new edition of Eustathius is available—we shall know all that can be known of the relations between Photius and Suidas, recover all that remains of the Atticists and the other authorities of Eustathius. A little wit with some malice might prompt a critic to jest at these imperfect beginnings of so vast an enterprise as the collection and comparison of the successors of the Alexandrines. But Schwabe is well aware that his work lacks finality. 'Fundamentum solidum struere visi sumus, in quo ipsa illa aedes atticismo purissimo sacra a posterioribus, si Deo placet, exstruatur.' Though we still feel that there is much that we do not understand, he has at least helped us towards the possession of the old Aelius and the old Pausanias. After how long a time shall we possess and understand *The New Aelius* and *The New Pausanias*?

E. C. MARCHANT.

WERNER'S ST. PAUL AND IRENAEUS.

Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur von Oscar von GEBHARDT und ADOLF HARNACK. VI. Band. Heft 2. *Der Paulinismus des Irenaeus Eine Kirchen- und dogmengeschichtliche Untersuchung über das Verhältniss des Irenaeus zu der Paulinischen Briefsammlung und Theologie.* Von Lic. DR. JOHANNES WERNER, Privatdocent an der Universität Marburg. Leipzig, 1889. pp. 218.

THIS work is divided into two parts of equal length. In the first part the relation of Irenaeus to the writings of S. Paul is investigated on the historical side; in the second, on the dogmatical side. In the first part an answer is sought to the question, What kind of authority had S. Paul and his writings for Irenaeus, and what kind of interest had he in them? The results of this investigation throw light upon the wider question, How did the Epistles of S. Paul win their way to general recognition as canonical? In the second part the question to be answered is, How far does the teaching of Irenaeus respecting leading

articles of the Christian faith agree with that of the Apostle? The answer to this question is a contribution to the history of primitive Christian doctrine.

Dr. Werner gives a list of treatises and articles on Irenaeus which fills two pages, but says that a great deal still remains to be done, and that he has not derived much help from any of the existing literature, excepting Ritschl's *Altkatholische Kirche* and Harnack's *Dogmengeschichte* with the monographs of Ziegler and Lipsius.

Harvey in his edition of Irenaeus gives 324 references to the Pauline Epistles; but many of these are of too vague a character to be admitted as quotations or reminiscences. Werner reduces the number to 206, which number does not include the 18 cases in which Irenaeus mentions that heretics quoted S. Paul in defence of their views. These 206 citations are thus distributed: Romans, 54; 1 Corinthians, 68; 2 Corinthians, 13; Galatians, 24; Ephesians, 16; Colossians, 7; 1 Thessalonians, 2; 2 Thessalonians, 9; 1 Timothy, 2; 2 Timothy, 2; Titus, 2. The number of quotations increases, as the work progresses; but apparently this is caused by the

arrangement of the subject-matter. There is nothing to show that the writings of S. Paul had acquired greater authority in the eyes of Irenaeus during the years in which he was engaged in writing the work on heresies. He treats them throughout as of authority; but probably he did not put them on the same level as the Gospels or the Old Testament. Not one of the 206 quotations from S. Paul is introduced with the formula, 'The Scripture saith,' He cites him as 'the Apostle,' not as Scripture; and 'the Apostle' seems to mean the writer himself, not a recognized collection of his Epistles. Yet it would be difficult to show that there is any essential difference between the authority which Irenaeus assigns to the Old Testament and the Gospels and that which he assigns to the writings of S. Paul. Dr. Werner thinks that, in the first instance, not only Irenaeus, but the primitive Church generally, was led to treat the Pauline Epistles as canonical more because they were found to be invaluable for polemical purposes, than because their contents were specially attractive, or were recognized as specially edifying. He thinks also that what delayed their full recognition as Scripture was not the fact that they emanated from one who was not one of the Twelve, but their profane literary form. There was no precedent in the Old Testament for inspired letters. Irenaeus seems to be not so much concerned to understand and reproduce the teaching of S. Paul, as to be able to quote S. Paul's authority for his own teaching. It is the latter which determines what he shall quote from the writings of the Apostle rather than the writings which determine what he shall teach. This point brings us to the second part of the treatise.

Irenaeus is pronounced to be a theologian and not a philosopher. It is not an intelligible

theory of the universe, but a description of how God deals with men, and how they may attain to God, that he desires to give: and he appeals, not to speculation, but to experience. His end is not truth, but practical Christianity. He lacks the scientific conscience. Theology with him is not science, but apologetics; and its business is to supply external supports to what is established, rather than to find out and establish what is true. Irenaeus starts from a cut-and-dried system, which he desires to fortify with proofs; and therefore he quotes S. Paul's words, without proper apprehension of what they really imply. He has no idea how widely he differs from S. Paul, for he has no head for system and does not see that the same form of words may express very different ideas. But he is grand in his contention for a practical Christianity exhibited in a moral life. He is a lover, not of controversy, but of peace; and he is moved to attack heretics, because they disturb the peace of the Church, not because he is fond of polemics. Hence there is little of personal bitterness in his criticisms. He lived in a time of *Sturm* and *Drang*, and we must measure him by that rather than by the breadth and depth of the teaching of S. Paul.

But one is inclined to doubt whether the critic is not himself guilty of some of the narrowness with which he is disposed to tax Irenaeus. The amount of difference between Irenaeus and S. Paul is perhaps less than that between Irenaeus and Dr. Werner's interpretation of S. Paul. In any case it must be remembered that for us the teaching of the Apostle has been illuminated by the experience of eighteen centuries, and that of that illumination Irenaeus had experienced only the beginning.

A. PLUMMER.

A GREEK STORY OF ST. MICHAEL, EDITED BY MAX BONNET.

Narratio de miraculo a Michaelis Archangelo Chonis patrato, adjecto Symeonis Metaphrastae de eadem re libello. Edidit MAX BONNET. (pp. xlv. 36. Paris, Hachette et Cie.: 1890.) 3 francs.

THE name Chonae was applied, it would seem, to a suburb of Colossae which afterwards supplanted the mother-city, on account of the funnel-shaped chasm into which the river Chryses disappeared at that spot. The

phenomenon is common in the district, as in many other limestone regions, and is associated with a peculiar petrifying action of the waters. The popular tendency to explain remarkable natural or prehistoric features of a country by supernatural agencies, and the angelolatrous proclivities which prevailed in this region (Col. ii. 18), naturally explain the existence both of the story that the disappearance of the river at Chonae was the work of S. Michael, and of a shrine